



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## EROTIC TEACHING IN ROMAN ELEGY AND THE GREEK SOURCES. PART II

BY ARTHUR LESLIE WHEELER

The erotic system of antiquity appears already highly developed in the New Comedy. In elegy, as we have seen, the rôle of erotic expert was remodeled to suit the requirements of the genre, and in the same way many of the precepts were subjected to changed applications and new conditions. In comedy the τέχνη ἐρωτική was predominantly a feminine art; in elegy it became even more predominantly masculine. The shift involved many changes of omission, alteration, and addition, for when the system had once become established, new principles based on both literature and life were evolved. It is not my purpose to follow in detail the variations of each precept, especially in Roman elegy, but to compare the Roman with the Greek and determine, if possible, the Greek source of each precept.

A surprisingly large number of the precepts employed by Roman elegists can be closely paralleled in Greek literature. Without attempting absolute completeness I shall discuss a majority of these together with the Greek parallels—enough to show the extent of the phenomenon itself and to support, as I hope, the inferences which I shall draw. Since the purpose of this paper is to throw light on Roman elegy, it is fitting to begin in each case with the Roman form of the precept.

Propertius (ii. 14, 19–20) states concisely the principle: Indifference begets love.

hoc sensi prodesse magis! contemnite, amantes:  
sic hodie veniet, si qua negavit heri.

The principle is effective because it arouses jealousy—fear of a rival. Propertius merely hints this (v. 31, *culpa*), but it is emphasized in the related passages of Ovid (*A.* ii. 19; *A.A.* ii. 435 ff.; iii. 580 ff.). The Greek parallels follow.

Lucian, *Dial. meretr.* viii (Ampelis, an older *meretrix*, to the less sophisticated Chrysis): "Οστις δὲ, ὦ Χρυσί, μήτε ζηλοτυπῇ μήτε ὀργίζεται μήτε ἑρράπισέ ποτε ἢ περιέκειρεν ἢ τὰ ἱμάτια περιέσχισεν, ἔτι ἑραστὴς ἐκείνός ἐστιν; . . . τὸ δὲ πῦρ ὅλον ἐκ τῆς ζηλοτυπίας ἐστίν . . . . Ζηλότυποι γὰρ καὶ μάλιστα λυπηθῆσονται . . . . μεγάλοι ἔρωτες γίγονται, εἰ πύθοιτο ἀμελεῖσθαι.

Ampelis then tells how she once punished a lover on this principle, one of the details being the usual exclusion—*ἀπέκλεισα*, as she puts it. The Twelfth Dialogue should be compared, and the Fifteenth proves that the principle does not work out in all cases.

Alciphron, *Epp.* ii. 1, 6, (p. 61, Fercher): διὸ καὶ μέγα τῶν ἑταιρουσῶν ἐστὶ σόφισμα, αἰὶ τὸ παρὸν τῆς ἀπολαύσεως ὑπερτιθεμένας ταῖς ἐλπὶσι διακρατεῖν τοὺς ἑραστάς, κ. τ. λ.—written by a *meretrix* to Demetrius.

*Ibid.* i. 37, 3 (Myrrha excludes Diphilus, who has been untrue, in order to bring him to his senses): εἴωθε γὰρ ἡ βαρύτης τῷ ἀμελεῖσθαι καταβάλλεσθαι; cf. iii. 50, 1.

Aristaenetos *Epp.* ii. 1, 20 (p. 158, Hercher); Aelianus writes to Calyce on behalf of Charidemus, whom she is maltreating: χαριέστατον οἶδα τὸ σμικρὸν ὑποκνίξειν τοὺς νέους· τοῦτο γὰρ τῶν ἀφροδισίων προαναπέμψαι τὸν κόρον καὶ τὰς ἐταίρας ἀποδείκνυσιν αἰὲ ποθενὰς τοῖς ἑρασταῖς· ἀλλ' εἰ τοῦτο γένοιτο πέρα τῆς χρείας, ἀποκάμνουσιν οἱ ποθοῦντες.

Heliodorus (viii. 5) puts the same principle into the mouth of Arsace's nurse: πεφύκασι γὰρ οἱ νέοι θεραπενόμενοι μὲν ὑπερφρονεῖν, βαζόμενοι δ' ὑπείκειν.

In comedy the principle appears several times:

Terence *Heauton.* 366 f.:

haec arte trac'abat virum  
ut illius animum cupidum inopia incenderet,  
eademque ut esset apud te hoc quam gratissimum.

*Eunuch.* 434 ff.:

*Thraso.* Sed heus tu, purgon ego me de istac Thaidi,  
Quod eam me amare suspicatast? *Gn.* Nil minus.  
Immo auge magis susp'cionem. *Th.* Quor? *Gn.* Rogas?  
Scin, si quando illa mentionem Phaedriae  
Facit aut si laudat, te ut male urat? *Th.* Sentio.  
*Gn.* Id ut ne fiat, haec res solast remedio:  
Ubi nominabit Phaedriam, tu Pamphilam  
Continuo; . . . denique  
Par pro pari referto, quod eam mordeat.

Cf. 812–13.

In the *Truculentus* Phronesium works upon three lovers in the same way.

Turpilius *Demiurgus*, frag. I R.<sup>3</sup>:

Ergo edepol docta dico: quae mulier volet  
Sibi suum amicum esse indulgentem et diutinum  
Modice atque parce eius serviat cupidines.

A survey of these passages shows that in the Greek the principle is an exclusively feminine one,<sup>1</sup> but in the Latin it has been adapted to masculine use. This is probably accident due to gaps in the sources, but it is decidedly significant that the whole process of transfer is evident within the limits of Roman elegy. In Propertius iv. 5, 29-32 and Ovid *A. i.* 8, 71-72 the *lena* speaks, i.e., the comic motif is transferred bodily to an elegiac setting; in Propertius ii. 14 the lover alone uses the principle; in Ovid *A. ii.* 19 both lover and *amica* use it. The second (Pr. ii. 14) is the truly elegiac form because the principle is there subjective-erotic. Ovid (*A. ii.* 19) represents that impudent and exaggerated frankness, that effort at piquancy, which so often marks his work in elegy as decadent.

The principle just discussed is closely connected with another: the anger—often violence—of the loved one indicates her (his) passion.<sup>2</sup> This appears in all three Romans, who glory in the violent attacks of the strenuous *amica*. Propertius devotes an entire elegy to the subject: iii. 8; cf. especially vss. 17-20.

his ego tormentis animi sum verus aruspex,  
has didici certo saepe in amore notas.  
non est certa fides, quam non in iurgia vertas.  
hostibus eveniat lenta puella meis!

Cf. iii. 12, 15-16 and iv. 8 (here stress is laid on Cynthia's jealous violence, not on the love that may be inferred from it). Even the

<sup>1</sup> *Eunuch.* 434 ff. is original with Terence according to Donatus, but undoubtedly suggested by some writer of the *réa*; cf. Legrand *op. cit.* 205.

<sup>2</sup> F. Wilhelm *Rh. M.* LVII (1902), 599-602, collects many of the following passages, but discusses them merely from the point of view of the violence, jealousy, etc., not distinguishing those in which there is didaxis.

"gentle Tibullus" expects such treatment if he proves false (i. 6, 69-73) although he deprecates extreme violence on the part of the lover (i. 10, 53-64; ii. 5, 101-4); cf. Ovid. *A.* i. 7; ii. 7; ii. 5 (her beauty disarms him); i. 8 (*lena's* advice); *A.A.* ii. 169 ff. (violence is not for the *impecunious* lover); ii. 447-69. Catullus (lxxxiii and xcii) states the same principle in epigrammatic form, with reference, however, to anger only.

Strenuous indeed was love in ancient times! From Aristophanes (*Plut.* 1013 ff.) down through comedy, epigram, bucolic poetry, Roman elegy, and the *erotici* there are frequent references to different aspects of this theme. Usually the pathetic situation of the much abused girl and the tardy remorse of the jealous lover are emphasized. Only in Roman elegy is there frequent stress on the didactic aspect, and the only good parallel for this is in Lucian *Dial. meretr.* viii, which has already been cited (p. 57). This dialogue presents the principle from the feminine standpoint exactly as Propertius (iii. 8) presents it from the masculine. In one or two other passages, e.g., Terence *Heauton.* 366 ff., 730 ff., Phronesium's treatment of Diniarchus in the *Truculentus*, Alciphron *Ep.* iii. 50, Lucian *Toxaris* 15-16, the narrator apparently perceives that the *meretrix* is arousing jealousy with conscious purpose, but there is no formal didaxis.<sup>1</sup>

Evidently the passages which picture the beauty and pathetic situation of the girl and the remorse of her jealous lover belong to a much wider field than comedy. On the other hand the exploitation of jealous anger and violence for didactic purposes was part of the *τέχνη έρωτική* of comedy, and it is probably not chance that the girl involved is always a *meretrix*, whereas in passages containing no didaxis she is more often of a higher station—a trait which enhances the pathos.

The inevitable lover's protestation of undying loyalty—loyalty unto death—is so often uttered by the elegists that illustrative

<sup>1</sup> Menander's *Περικειρομένη* and probably the *'Ραπιζομένη* were the great dramatic treatments of the maltreated girl and her remorseful lover. These plays have echoes in epigram and the epistolographers; cf. especially *A.P.* v. 40, 42, 219, 247, and Philostratus *Ep.* lxi. The words *περικέλω* and *ραπιζώ* occur in many of the passages; see Lucian *D.M.* viii (p. 57). On the influence of this motif in Roman elegy cf. Wilhelm *op. cit.*, and Buerger *De Ovid. carmm. inventione*, etc., p. 23.

passages may be confined to those which involve didaxis. Of these I find only two, both in Propertius:<sup>1</sup> i. 10, 29–30 (to Gallus):

is poterit felix una remanere puella,  
qui numquam vacuo pectore liber erit;

i. 1, 35–36 (to lovers in general):

hoc, moneo, vitate malum: sua quemque moretur  
cura, neque assueto mutet amore locum.

But although Propertius seems to have been the first to urge the principle didactically,<sup>2</sup> there are closely connected themes which may be traced back into the Greek. The first of these appears in the *foedus* or *syngraphus* with which lovers seek to bind each other fast by means of oaths in order that treachery may meet with divine vengeance. The regular declaration of the lover seems to have been *tu mihi sola places*; cf. Tib. iv. 13, 3; Prop. ii. 7, 19. and especially Ovid *A.A.* i. 42 where it is used as typical. Such a *foedus* may be offered before an "affair" has begun (Prop. iii. 20, 15 ff.) or after its beginning (Tib. iv. 13)—especially when a reconciliation occurs (Prop. iv. 8, 74 ff.) or is hoped for (Tib. i, 6, 69–70).<sup>3</sup>

In Lucian *Dial. Meretr.* viii, Ampelis tells how she extracted a *foedus* from Demophantus by arousing his jealousy. This *foedus*, therefore, resulted from a clever use of the τέχνη ἐρωτική. Crocale (*ibid.* xv) gets into trouble by attempting the same ruse with Deino-machus, the soldier. In these passages Lucian was certainly following the lead of comedy,<sup>4</sup> and comedy itself affords several good examples of the *foedus*. The most instructive of these is the comic parody

<sup>1</sup> Excluding Ovid.

<sup>2</sup> According to these passages a happy result ought to attend the loyal lover, but woman's fickleness and other causes usually interfere; cf. Prop. i. 15b, 29–32 (loyalty beautifully asserted), but 41–42: quis ego nunc pereo, similes moniturus amantes | "O nullis tutum credere blanditiis"—in which her faithlessness draws from the lover quite a different *sententia*. For assertions of loyalty in Greek see Philostratus *Epp.* 7 and 23; Aristaeetus *Epp.* ii. 9. These are not didactic, but the last passage is much like Tib. i. 9, 1–6, 31–38; cf. Gollnisch, pp. 60–61.

<sup>3</sup> Leo *Rh.M.* lv (1900), 604–11, has discussed the *foedus*, not, however, with reference to didaxis. He thinks that Hellenistic elegy had already adapted it from comedy.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Legrand, p. 189.

of the *foedus* made for Diabolus and Philaenium (*As.* 746–809).<sup>1</sup> The various clauses of this contract are full of comic absurdities, but the whole is based on a real custom which was first turned to literary use by comedy. The loyalty which is urged upon lovers by Propertius is thus connected in both elegy and comedy with the *foedus*, and although it cannot be proved to have assumed a didactic form before Propertius, the evidence of Lucian that the *foedus* was often the goal of the wily *meretrix* renders it probable that loyalty, the chief principle of the *foedus*, was also part of her system.

The lover, in theory at least, believed in the power of his own loyalty to win his obdurate *amica*, but practically he knew that something more substantial was necessary, and so his assertions of loyalty are usually accompanied by references to past services. These services, which are termed collectively *obsequium*,<sup>2</sup> fall into fairly well-defined groups<sup>3</sup> which had become conventional in erotic literature and are decked out with such variations of detail as suited each poet's imagination. I shall consider only those which are offered as precepts.

The best statements of the general principle of *obsequium* are Prop. i. 10, 21–30 (to Gallus):

tu cave ne tristi cupias pugnare puellas,  
                   neve superba loqui, neve tacere diu:  
 neu si quid petiit, ingrata fronte negaris,  
 . . . . .  
 at quo sis humilis magis et subiectus Amori,  
                   hoc magis effectu saepe fruire bono.

Tib. i. 4, 39–54, especially 40:

obsequio plurima vincit amor.

Into this passage are crowded various details of such *obsequium*: 41–46, journey with the loved one; 47–50, work, hunt, fence with him. In both of these elegies the assertion of undying loyalty finds

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also *As.* 229–40; *Cist.* 460; *Bacch.* 575 f., frag. x (xvii); Terence, *Hec.* 86–87.

<sup>2</sup> Each particular form of service is also an *obsequium*.

<sup>3</sup> The most prominent are service to the sick *amica* (Tib. i. 5, 9–18; Prop. ii. 28, etc.); hardships endured in her behalf (Tib. i. 2, 29–32, etc.); toil of a journey with her (Prop. ii. 26b, 29 ff., etc.), or a hunt (Prop. ii. 19, 17–26; Tib. iv. 3; Ov. *A.A.* ii. 189 f., etc.); work in the country (Tib. ii. 3, 5–10; i. 4, 47–48, etc.).

a place: cf. Prop. vss. 29–30; Tib. 21–26. Ovid naturally makes much of the *obsequium*-motif (A.A. ii. 177–250).

Achilles Tatius, i. 9, 6: *εἰ γὰρ τὰ ἄγρια τῶν θηρίων συνηθεία τιθασεύεται, πολὺ μᾶλλον ταύτη μαλαχθεῖη καὶ γύνη.*

This is part of the didaxis of Clinias, cf. Vol. V, p. 446.

The motif of toil in the country is often stated,<sup>1</sup> but is presented as didaxis only in Tibullus i. 4, 47–48:

nec te paeniteat duros subiisse labores  
aut opera insuetas atteruisse manus;

and Ovid, A.A. ii. 239–42:

Cynthiaus Admeti vaccas pavisse Pheraei  
fertur et in parva delituisse casa:  
quod Phoebum decuit, quem non decet? exue fastus,  
curam mansuri quisquis amoris habes!

Service in the hunt is closely connected with this. It is didactic in Tibullus i. 4, 49–50:

nec, velit insidiis altis si claudere valles,  
dum placeas, umeri retia ferre negent.

Cf. Ovid, A.A. ii. 189 ff. (of Milanion), but Ovid thinks this type of service unlikely to be required (*ibid.* 193–96).

Plutarch: Πῶς ἂν τις διακρίνει τὸν κόλακα τοῦ φίλου, 7 p. 52 B: *θηρατικοῦ δὲ καὶ κυνηγετικοῦ λαβόμενος. . ἀναβοῶν ἔπεται ἑπὶ θεῶν ἔραμαι κυσὶ θωῶξαι βαλίσαι ἐλάφοις ἐγχιπτόμενος*.

So the *κόλαξ* wrestles and enters the race with the object of his wiles (*ibid.* p. 58E).<sup>2</sup>

The mythological *παραδείγματα* of the *obsequium*-motif in its various forms are the stories of Milanion, of Ἄπολλο and Admetus, and of Hercules and Omphale. The submissive toil by which Milanion won the love of Arcadian Atalanta is used by Propertius (i. 1, 13 ff.)

<sup>1</sup> Wilhelm *Rh.M.* LIX (1904), 279 ff. (on *Copia rara videndi*, Tib. ii. 3, 77) gives Tib. ii. 3, 5 ff.; i. 4, 47–48; Philostr. *Ep.* 59; *A.P.* xvi. 200. The other passages belong to the hunt (Prop. ii. 19) or other themes.

<sup>2</sup> Wilhelm (*Satura Viadrina*, p. 50) thinks that the writings *περὶ κολακίας* were sources of Plutarch and the Roman elegists, but he traces the system back to comedy and admits that the Romans may have used comedy directly. This latter possibility seems much more likely since there is good evidence that comedy was well known to the Romans and none that the obscure discussions *περὶ κολακίας* were known at all.



to illustrate the power of services in love and to serve as a contrast to his own hopeless state. In Ovid (*A.A.* ii. 185–92) Milanion again illustrates the *obsequium* which the poet is recommending:

Quid fuit asperius Nonacrina Atalanta?  
 subcubuit meritis trux tamen illa viri:  
 saepe suos casus nec mitia facta puellae  
 flesse sub arboribus Milaniona ferunt;  
 saepe tulit iusso fallacia retia collo,  
 saepe fera torvos cuspidē fixit apros, etc.

The hunt is here specified as part of his service, for Atalanta was a huntress. The story of Apollo's service to Admetus, on the other hand, is idyllic and illustrates the motif of toil in the country. It is told at length by Tibullus (ii. 3, 11–32) and is one of the very few myths on which he dwells at any length—a fact which emphasizes the importance of the idyllic element in his elegies; cf. also Lygd. 4. 67; Ovid *A.A.* ii. 239 ff.<sup>1</sup> Ovid alone uses it didactically.<sup>2</sup>

The story of Hercules and Omphale is often used to illustrate the power of woman; cf. Prop. iii. 11, 17–20; Terence *Eun.* 1027; Achilles Tat. ii. 6, etc. Weak men—*homunciones*, to quote Terence—find in it a plea for their own errors.<sup>3</sup> But Ovid alone, as in the case of the myth of Apollo and Admetus, has given to this tale a decidedly didactic turn (*A.A.* ii. 217–22).<sup>4</sup>

Our extant evidence indicates that these myths were first used for didactic purposes by the Romans. Buerger and Wilhelm think that Ovid and Lygdamus drew on Tibullus (i. 4, 47–48) in their emphasis on the service (*obsequium*) of Apollo to Admetus, but in Tibullus i. 4 the myth is not even alluded to. There seems to be no justification, therefore, for this view, and still less for that of

<sup>1</sup> See p. 62.

<sup>2</sup> The myth appears in many erotic writers and in some versions Bacchus takes the place of Apollo. It is represented also in art; cf. Helbig *Campan. Wandmalerei*, p. 260. See Wilhelm *Rh.M.* LIX (1904), 279 ff., and Kalkmann *De Eurip. Hipp.*, p. 123 (cited by Wilhelm).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Anth. Pal.* v. 99; Achill. Tat. i. 5, 7. In both of these passages the gods are cited as *bad* examples!

<sup>4</sup> This story, like that of Apollo and Admetus, was a favorite subject in Campanian art; cf. Helbig *Campan. Wandmal.* 377, who thinks that Ovid's elaborate version (*Her.* ix. 53–118) is based on such pictures.

Wilhelm that the precept of service was inserted into the myths (Admetus-Apollo and Hercules-Omphale) by the Alexandrians. On the contrary the passages show that the two stories were originally used to illustrate the power of love over even the gods, and that only after the didactic tendency had become well established in elegy were they seized upon to illustrate the *obsequium*-motif. The process was not insertion of didaxis into the myths, but use of the myths to illustrate didaxis. The myths themselves may very possibly have appeared in Alexandrian elegy—this is just the content of that genre of which we are most certain—but nothing indicates that they were already connected in Alexandrian elegy with didaxis.<sup>1</sup>

When positive services are of no avail the lover may at least take refuge in complaisance, knowing the faithlessness of the *amica* but concealing his jealousy lest he lose even what standing he has or ruin his chance of winning her back. This attitude is stated by Catullus (lxviii. 135–48), Tibullus (iv. 14), and Ovid (A. iii. 14), who with the usual exaggeration urges the *amica* to hide her infidelity from the poet.<sup>2</sup> It is offered as a precept by Propertius ii. 18, 1–4:

assiduae multis odium peperere querelae:  
frangitur in tacito femina saepe viro.  
si quid vidisti, semper vidisse negato:  
aut si quid doluit forte, dolere nega.

Cynthia is false (vs. 19), but the lover must be complaisant if he hopes to reconquer her. The situation in ii. 32 is the same (cf. especially 23–30), and Cynthia's conduct is palliated by that of many heroines and even of Lesbia (45) with reference probably to Catullus *loc. cit.*<sup>3</sup>

This is another bit of *lena*'s teaching adapted to masculine use; cf. Ovid, A. i. 8, 81–82 (*lena*'s precept), A.A. ii. 539 ff., and Lucian, *Dialog. meretr.* iii, *ad fin.*, in which Philinna's mother rebukes her for having gone too far in her harsh treatment of Diphilus. Her principle is like that of Propertius and Ovid (A.A. *loc. cit.*): ὀργίζου

<sup>1</sup> Wilhelm even ventures the view that Ovid's *Ars amatoria* had predecessors in Alexandrian literature!

<sup>2</sup> The passages are collected by Wilhelm, *Rh.M.* LIX (1904), except Catullus, *loc. cit.*

<sup>3</sup> Cf. also Prop. ii. 20, 13 f. and ii. 16, 25 f.

μέν, μὴ ἀνθύβριζε, οὐκ οἶσθα ὅτι ὑβριζόμενοι παύονται οἱ ἐρώντες καὶ ἐπιτιμῶσιν ἑαυτοῖς; The evidence clearly points to comedy as the ultimate source of this precept.<sup>1</sup>

The belief in the power of song over womankind appears very often in Roman elegy. It may aid the poet to win the object of his love (Prop. i. 7 and 9; ii. 34, 31 ff; iii. 2, 8; ii. 26b; Tib. i. 4, 61-72; Lygd. 4. 43 ff.; Ov. A. i. 3) or to retain her affections if she has already been won (Prop. i. 8b, 40; ii. 13. 7; ii. 26b, 25 f.; iii. 1, 40).<sup>2</sup> The didactic tone appears clearly in a number of these passages, e.g., Prop. i. 9, 13-14:

i quaeso et tristis istos compone libellos,  
et cane quod quaevis nosse puella velit!

iii. 2, 9-10 (=iii. 1, 47-48):

miremur nobis et Baccho et Apolline dextro,  
turba puellarum si mea verba colit?

cf. ii. 34, 31-46; ii. 26 (26b), 21-26.

The passages in Ovid also are strongly didactic. With his usual knowledge of feminine psychology Ovid is clever enough to recognize that the women who are really influenced by verse are few. In A.A. ii. 273 ff. he admits that *carmina* yield to *munera* and adds (281):

Sunt tamen et doctae, rarissima turba, puellae,  
altera non doctae turba, sed esse volunt;

cf. *ibid.* iii. 551 f. Cynthia belonged to this *rarissima turba*, if we may believe Propertius, in spite of her *avaritia*.

This belief in the efficacy of song is, therefore, the professed masculine attitude—often sorrowfully admitted to be wrong, when affairs are not running smoothly.<sup>3</sup> The feminine principle, which stood in sharp opposition, was: Gold, not song. This is clearly stated by the *lena* (Prop. iv. 5. 47-56):

<sup>1</sup> Wilhelm, *loc. cit.*, correctly decides that the principle is Greek, but cites only Plato, *leg.* v. 731E, and Menander, fr. 48K, which have nothing to do with this kind of indulgence on the part of the lover.

<sup>2</sup> When all resources have failed, the poet's verse, narrating his own fate, serves to warn others (Prop. i. 1, 37 f.; i. 10, 13-20; i. 15b, 41; Ov. A. iii. 8, 25-29, etc.).

<sup>3</sup> In addition to the two passages of Ovid last cited cf. *Am.* i. 8, 49 ff.; i. 10; Tib. i. 9, 47-52; ii. 4, 13-20.

aurum spectato, non quae manus afferat aurum!  
 versibus auditis quid nisi verba feres?  
 'Quid iuvat ornato procedere, vita, capillo  
 et tenuis Coa veste movere sinus?'  
 qui versus, Coae dederit nec munera vestis,  
 ipsius tibi sit surda sine aere lyra.

Cf. Ovid *A. i.* 8 (*lena's* teaching), especially v. 61:

qui dabit, ille tibi magno sit maior Homero.

The masculine attitude is cleverly urged, with full allowance for feminine *avaritia*, except in the case of poets, by Ovid, *A. i.* 10, especially vss. 59–62:

Est quoque carminibus meritas celebrare puellas:  
 dos mea! quam volui, nota fit arte mea.  
 scindentur vestes, gemmae frangentur et aurum:  
 carmina quam tribuent, fama perennis erit.<sup>1</sup>

Both the masculine *blanditia* and its feminine rebuttal come from comedy. It is unnecessary to trace the *avaritia* of the meretrix to comedy, for the trait is too common in Plautus and Terence to call for proof,<sup>2</sup> but we need a passage in which the avaricious *meretrix* scouts the idea that mere *carmina* can win her favor. Such a passage<sup>3</sup> is Aristaen. *Epp. i.* 14 (partly transcribed above, V, 445). The theme of this letter is that music and song are of no avail without money: οὔτε αὐλὸς ἐταίραν οἶδε οὔτε λύρα τις ἐφέλκεται πόρνας ἀργυρίου χωρίς· κέρδει μόνον δουλεύομεν, οὐ θελγόμεθα μελῳδαίαις, etc. There is even a mocking interpretation of what the youths mean by their songs; cf. Prop. iv. 5, 54*ab*, which the *lena* quotes in mockery from i. 2, 1 f. The name of the ἐταῖρα who is supposed

<sup>1</sup> Gollnisch compares Philostratus *Epp.* 29 (53): τοῦτων δ' εἰ πάντων σὺ φάρμακον, ἔργου ἐφημέρου ποιήματα ἀθάνατα καὶ βραχείας σώματος ἡδονῆς μνήμην ἀντιλαβοῦσα ἀγήρω—Boissonade's ed. 1842. I do not find this in Hercher's ed. 1873.

<sup>2</sup> The two opposed principles occur (in elegy) in Ovid, *A.A.* iii. 533–52; ii. 273–86; Tib. ii. 4, 13–20 (in which Tibullus accepts with sorrow the feminine argument). With the last passage cf. Ov. *A.* iii. 8, 1–8, 23–30. The *avaritia* gives rise to many an attack upon it (Prop. iii. 13; Tib. i. 4, 57–70; Ov. *A.* iii. 8; i. 10) and invectives against wealthy rivals (Prop. ii. 9; Tib. i. 5; i. 9; ii. 3), or to praises of the simple past (Prop. iii. 13, 25 ff.; Tib. ii. 3, 69 ff.), which often pass into descriptions of the Golden Age.

<sup>3</sup> In Ter. *Hec.* 58 ff. gain is opposed to masculine *blanditiae* in general, but not to song; cf. *Asin.* 525 ff.

to write the letter, Philematium, is taken from comedy—cf. the *Mostellaria*.<sup>1</sup>

The foregoing parallels prove that the themes of the power of song and the *avaritia* of the *amica* had not only appeared in comedy, the latter as one of the commonest of the *lena*'s precepts, but also that the two had appeared in the same relation as in Prop. iv. 5 and Ovid *A.* i. 8—two elegies which present another excellent instance of bodily transfer of a motive from comedy. Both motives appear separately in many other elegies, with or without didaxis. The power of song was peculiarly adapted to elegiac treatment, but life had remained the same and many of these passages are found in connection with evidence that the *lena*'s instruction was still effective with her pupils. It is natural, therefore, that the power of song should be presented as a principle worthy of acceptance only in those rare moments in which love is running smoothly or when the elegist is dealing with theory rather than practice.<sup>2</sup>

When all resources fail the desperate lover, various cures for his love (*remedia amoris*) suggest themselves or are suggested by his friend. But if he is really in love, as he is represented to be in Propertius and Tibullus, these cures are mere possibilities introduced to heighten the effect and proposed only to be rejected. The lover expects death unless his parlous state, which is thus effectively represented to the *amica*, softens her hard heart. Propertius and Tibullus do not, therefore, mention the *remedia amoris* as precepts which are

<sup>1</sup> In Plaut. *Merc.* 408 old Demipho gives as one of the reasons against lodging the fair girl in his house: *impleantur elegeorum meae fores carbonibus | atque . . . homines . . . uxori meae | mihique obiectent lenocinium facere*. Undoubtedly this is taken from the Greek original of Philemon, as the word *elegeorum* with the familiar early Latin shortening of the penult (cf. *plata*: *πλατεία*) indicates. It is the only reference in comedy, as Legrand (*op. cit.* 51) remarks, to *graffiti*; and it is interesting to note that the allusion is to distichs—a sort of parietal epigram. The custom would seem to have been a common one in the time of the *vêa*, as it was later at Pompeii. Legrand cites Lucian *D.M.* iv and x—also suggested by comedy.

<sup>2</sup> Gollnisch, pp. 39 ff., regards this principle as part of the motif of the *pauper amator*. Under the same head he classifies a number of other themes—detestation of greed, attacks on avaricious *amicae*, complaints of the success of wealthy rivals, precepts of the elegists to poor lovers and of *lenae* to girls—but aside from his omission of passages in which the power of song is not subordinated to the motif of the *pauper amator* (Prop. ii. 34; i. 9; iii. 2, etc.), he elevates to an inclusive category what is really a mere detail. The *paupertas* of the elegists was a convention necessary to the treatment of many a theme, but it is hardly the source of those themes.

of any use to themselves or others—the didaxis was reserved for the flippant Ovid (*Remedia amoris*)—but many cures which Ovid puts into didactic form appear in the work of his two predecessors,<sup>1</sup> e.g. Prop. iii. 17 (wine); cf. Tib. i. 5, 37 (tried without success!); *ibid.* i. 2, 1 ff.; Ovid *R.A.* 132, 146, 803–10 (a dangerous remedy!); Prop. iii. 21 (the journey to cure love); cf. Ovid *R.A.* 213–24 (*dura praecepta*!); Prop. ii. 4, 1 = ii. 3, 45; cf. *ibid.* ii. 25, 39 ff. (drive out the old love with the new); cf. Tib. i. 5, 39–42 (tried in vain!) and Ovid *R.A.* 441 ff.

For Propertius and Tibullus, therefore, no cures for love exist. Their precept is a negation: there is no cure, no escape. This is clearly stated by Propertius (ii. 4, 11–12):

Non eget hic medicis, non lectis mollibus aeger,  
ambulat et subito mirantur funus amici!

cf. ii. 1, 57–58:

omnis humanos sanat medicina dolores  
solus Amor morbi non amat artificem.<sup>3</sup>

The conception of love as a disease is familiar enough in Greek and is a part of the τέχνη ἐρωτική of comedy. Plautus (*Cist.* 71–74) represents the two *meretrices*, Selenium and Gymnasium, discussing the nature of Amor:

*Sel.* ad istam faciem est morbus qui me . . macerat.  
*Gy.* perfidiosus est Amor. *Sel.* ergo in me peculatum facit.  
*Gy.* bono animo es, erit isti morbo melius. *Sel.* confidam fore,  
si medicus veniat qui huic morbo facere medicinam potest.

Longus (ii. 7, 7), in a discussion by old Philetas on the nature of love, gives utterance to the same precept that we have just noted in Roman elegy: ἐρωτος γὰρ οὐδὲν φάρμακον. Both Plautus and Longus hint that the only relief is that which comes from the loved one.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Leo *PLF.* 133 Anm. 2, who mentions a number of the following passages.

<sup>2</sup> The lover in Aristaenetos i. 12 finds that "absence makes the heart grow fonder."

<sup>3</sup> Cf. i. 1, 25 ff. (frantic appeal to friends for relief); i. 5, 28 (no cure—didaxis in his own interest); ii. 30, 1 (a denial of the journey-motif, suggested in iii. 21); Tib. ii. 3, 13 (Apollo's herbs are useless). Ovid says, with his usual exaggerated frankness, that he will accept no cure (*A.* ii, 9b).

The precept that there is no cure for love is naturally connected with descriptions of the desperate plight of the lover. All the passages in which cures are rejected as useless are coupled with such descriptions,<sup>1</sup> but Propertius i. 1 is especially significant because this elegy was intended as a general introduction to Book I, if not a larger part of the elegies, and therefore presents the typical condition of the lover-poet. Both this elegy and ii. 4 are warnings to others to avoid the evils of such a state.<sup>2</sup> It matters not what is the cause of her obduracy. The lover suffers in any case, but his woe is expected to arouse her pity.

The same desperate plight is pictured in Longus and in the *Cistellaria*, although in the former the lovers are still *rudes*, in the latter external circumstances have caused the trouble. The *Cistellaria* is indeed filled with elegiac sentiment and there are passages which recall more than one elegiac motif. Note the anguish of Alcesimarchus (203-30):

qui omnis homines . . antideo cruciabilitatibus animi  
iactor, crucior, agitor,  
stimulor, vorsor  
in amoris rota, etc.

Selenium is heartbroken in her fear that the youth, who has been ordered to marry another, will desert her in spite of his promises—apparently a *foedus*. Alcesimarchus, equally despondent, tries by means of oaths and protestations to secure Selenium, but is rebuffed by her supposed mother, the *meretrix* Melaenis. All these details may be paralleled in Roman elegy, but the happy ending of the play is ill adapted to elegiac treatment. The difficulties of your true elegist are never solved with such finality.

Another detail of the despairing lover's situation which is an echo of comedy is his involuntary return to the door of her who has rejected him (Prop. ii. 4, 4: *dubio . . . pede*; ii. 25, 30; *invitis ipse redit pedibus*; Tib. ii. 5, 13: *pes tamen ipse redit*); cf. Terence, *Eunuch*. 46 ff. paraphrased by Horace (*Sat.* ii. 3, 260 ff.—here also love is a *morbus*, in the Stoic sense). It seems, therefore, that both

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Tib. ii. 3, 78; ii. 4, 1 ff.

<sup>2</sup> ii. 4 is counter-didaxis to certain friends who had suggested remedies.

the figure of the despairing lover and his hopeless precept, the incurability of love, were developed in comedy.<sup>1</sup>

So much has been written on the possible sources of Propertius i. 2 that I hesitate to enter the discussion.<sup>2</sup> Some points, however, may be urged. The thought of this graceful little elegy is in outline: Why seek adornment, my love? Your natural beauty needs no adornment (1-8). Behold the beauties of nature (9-14), and consider the heroines of old who, though seeking no adornment, won and were true to a single lover (15-24). Your charms will always hold me in thrall without any external aid (25-32).<sup>3</sup> The doctrine "beauty unadorned" is not preached sincerely by Propertius, for he realizes the girl's purpose in adorning herself; cf. vss. 23-26 and the emphasis on *illis*, i.e., *they* did not seek crowds of lovers, but *you* do. This proves that the description is that of a *meretrix*, a fact which is enforced by iv. 5, 55-56 (*lena's* precepts) which repeat the two opening lines of this elegy as typical of the stuff poured into a girl's ears by the self-seeking lover). The girl is, therefore, practicing that attention to personal adornment which was taught by the *lenae* in comedy, and the closest parallels to the elegy are found in comedy or in literature which received the motif directly or indirectly from comedy, e.g., Plautus, *Most.* i. 3, the famous toilet scene, in which the old *meretrix*-servant, Scapha, at first urges upon the loyal Philematium that very pursuit of "crowds of lovers" against which Propertius is covertly preaching: cf. *Most.* 188-90 (*matronae non meretricium est unum inservire amanti*), 195-203, etc., but at last, finding the girl true to Philolaches, to save herself and to flatter her mistress, she preaches the doctrine of beauty unadorned; cf. 250-92. She closes this part of her advice

<sup>1</sup> I have not dealt with other *remedia*—philters, magic, etc.—because they are not presented didactically except by Ovid. The sources of the *Remedia amoris* offer an interesting field of investigation. On the use of magic cf. Wilhelm *Ph.* LX (1901), 579 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Leo *Gött. Gelehrt. Anz.* (1898), p. 726; Gollnisch *Quaestt. elegiac.*, pp. 26-31; Wilhelm *Phil.* LX (1901), 579 ff. (on Tib. i. 8); Legrand *Rev. des ét. grec.*, p. 202; Hoelzer *op. cit.*

<sup>3</sup> Prop. ii. 18b has the same thought without, however, the implication of jealousy; cf. Tib. i. 8, 15 f. and the beautiful iv. 2 (not of a *meretrix*). Ovid *A.A.* iii. 257 ff. proceeds from the same thought—*cultus* is not necessary for the real beauties, though (*ibid.* 101-250) it is a very valuable aid to most *meretrices*, cf. *medicamina faciei*.



with a perfect broadside of *sententiae* (288–92) epitomizing the whole: *purpura aetati occultandaest, aurum turpi mulieri . . . . pulcra mulier nuda erit quam purpurata pulerior . . . . poste nequiquam exornata est bene, si morata est male. . . . nam si pulcra est nimis ornatast; cf. Poen. 301–8.*

These striking agreements between Plautus and Propertius clearly indicate that the motif came to Roman elegy from comedy, whether directly or indirectly. In Philostratus *Epp.* 22 (40) we have a letter which has the same thought as Propertius i. 2—except that there is no clear hint of jealousy—cf. especially ἡ δὲ καλὴ οὐδενὸς δέεται τῶν ἐπικτήτων . . . τὸ δ' ἀκόσμητον ἀληθῶς καλόν. The letter emphasizes the point—found alike in the *Mostellaria* and Ovid—that adornment serves especially to hide blemishes; cf. 36 (67). In Lucian, *Dialog. meretr.* vi. 3 Crobyle, a *lena*, telling how Lyra, a model *meretrix*, has succeeded so well, gives as one of the items: κατακοσμοῦσα ἑαυτὴν εὐπρεπῶς. Again in the *Ἐρωτες* (39–42) Lucian penetrates, like a second Ovid, into all the secrets of the feminine toilet, and the purpose of all this beautification is the same that is briefly hinted by Propertius. Lastly in Plautus, *Poen.* 210 ff., there is a long discussion of the same theme by Adelphasium and Anterastilis, who are about to go in search of lovers. A few quotations from this will suffice. Adelphasium professes to think that the toilet may be overdone and Anterastilis rejoins (233–35): *miror equidem, soror, te istaec sic fabulari | quae tam callida et docta sis et faceta. | nam quom sedulo munditer nos habemus, | vix aegreque amatorculos invenimus, i.e., adornment is a necessary part of the art. Adelphasium agrees on the main point, but thinks that everything should have a limit: excess annoys men.<sup>1</sup> This last recalls Scapha's remarks (*Most.* 168–70). Stephanium's soliloquy (*Stich.* 744–47) is briefer, but to the same effect.<sup>2</sup>*

The theme of adornment is presented didactically by Tibullus i. 8, 9–16, but the application is different. The passage is addressed to a youth who is vainly trying to win the favor of a girl whose

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Horace's *simplex munditiis* (i. 5).

<sup>2</sup> Comedy naturally poked much fun at the feminine propensity for adornment; cf. Aristoph. fr. 320K; Antiphanes, 148; Alexis, 98; Euboulus, 98; Plautus *Aulul.* 507 ff.; *Epid.* 222 ff., etc.

fancy is directed elsewhere, and Tibullus asserts that all his care is useless, although *she* pleases even without adornment. The same application may be found in *Anth. Pal.* v. 298, and the simple thought of the effect produced by beauty unadorned (of a girl), *ibid.* v. 25 and 259; cf. also 298, 299, and Ovid *A.A.* iii. 433-38 (a warning to girls to beware of the male flirt with his fine toilets).

The evidence presented indicates at least that the ultimate sources of Propertius i. 2 are to be sought in comedy. In comedy we have found both the precept that adornment is essential to win lovers for the *meretrix* (this is the typical form) and also that real beauty accomplishes the same result without adornment. Both these principles appear in Ovid's *Handbook* and (also from comedy) the additional teaching that adornment is really meant for those who have some blemish to conceal. The epigrams of the *Anthology* contain the motif of beauty unadorned, but they do not combine it with its obvious purpose as we find it in comedy and in Propertius. In fact the epigrams have much closer connection with Tibullus i. 8 than with Propertius. Nowhere are the two motives connected with jealousy on the part of the writer as in Propertius. This is the chief elegiac touch—together with the assertion of devotion at the end of the poem. The list of heroines also (15-22) is a trait belonging rather to elegy. From the structural point of view the poem might very well be an expanded epigram. The first eight verses make a very pretty epigram as they stand, and the rest of the poem could very easily have grown out of such an epigrammatic suggestion.<sup>1</sup> But although many a poem of Catullus, Propertius, and Ovid can be readily explained as a padded epigram, we ought not to adopt the explanation in a case which presents such striking agreements with another genre.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This is the view of Leo *Pl.F.*, pp. 129 ff.; *G.G.A.* (1898), p. 726, and of Jacoby *op. cit.*

<sup>2</sup> Gollnisch (p. 31), while proving that Prop. i. 2 does not agree with epigram, nevertheless goes astray in pointing to Alexandrian elegy as the source. He compares Nonnus *Dionys.* 42, 74-88 (on Beroe who had a beauty *ὑπερ φύσιν εἶχε* and who rejects cosmetics). Since the rejection of cosmetics is a trait that does not fit the daughter of Venus, Nonnus must be following a poet who described a mortal in this way, i.e., expressed his own feeling; and the agreement with Prop. i. 2 and *Most.* i. 3 points to Alexandrian elegy. This is a characteristic argument and it can hardly be accepted unless it is proved that Nonnus never used the New Comedy—an assumption

Limits of space forbid the extension of this investigation to other cases in which the material is less full, but the evidence presented is sufficient to establish certain results which could hardly be modified in any essential way by the study of precepts for which few Greek parallels exist. Wherever the evidence is adequate it points to New Comedy as the ultimate source of the erotic teaching which appears in Roman elegy. Furthermore, there was often direct use of the New Comedy. The elegist assumes the rôle assigned in comedy to the *lena*, the *meretrix*, or the *adulescens*, and even the comic form of the rôle survives in Roman elegy (Prop. iv. 5; Ov. A. i. 8), where it is so presented that the poet represents the eavesdropping youth of the stage. The rôle therefore has two forms, of which one is merely the transfer of the comic form to an elegiac setting. The precepts also appear in two forms according as they represent the feminine attitude—the original form of comedy—or the masculine, in which they are adapted more completely to elegiac requirements. The erotic teaching of the elegists is thus a system in process of adaptation. This indicates a direct use of comedy by the Romans, and the influence is strengthened in several instances by the closer agreement of Roman elegy with New Comedy than with other Greek parallels.

The same form of argument may be used with reference to the relation of the later Greek parallels to the New Comedy. It is certain, for example, that Lucian used the New Comedy directly; it is not certain in any case (Aristaenetus, Alciphron, Philostratus, etc.) that the influence of comedy came indirectly through the medium of Alexandrian elegy. In short the interposition of Alexandrian elegy is not only unnecessary in order to explain the influence of comedy but is often an improbable explanation.<sup>1</sup>

The evidence derived from a study of the parallels is strengthened by some facts of literary history and by certain general considerations. From the very beginnings of Roman attempts to naturalize

which lies at the basis of the argument. Gollnisch refers to F. Mallet, *Quaestt. Propert.*, p. 36, Adn. 1, who infers from certain agreements between Nonnus and the epigrammatists that the former was a *sectator* of the Alexandrians. More proof is necessary.

<sup>1</sup> Careful investigation will establish this, I believe, for Philostratus and Aristaenetus at least.

Greek literature the influence of the Alexandrians went hand in hand with that of the early Greeks. No clearer example of this can be found than the work of Catullus. We think of him, and quite properly, as one of the *νεώτεροι*, but there was room in the receptive mind of Catullus—and this applies to most cultured Romans—for all that impressed him as excellent in any period of Greek literature. Although he adopted some of the literary tenets of Callimachus, he was no narrow sectarian, and we find him translating and adapting both Sappho and Callimachus. The same eclectic spirit characterizes the Augustan elegists and even Horace, and after all it was the Alexandrian insistence on niceties, not to say over-niceties, of form that distinguished the *νεώτεροι* rather than anything peculiar in the themes and content of their work. The close connection between Callimachus and Catullus allows us to detect no strain of erotodidaxis in the former.<sup>1</sup> The subjective-erotic note of Callimachus is confined to his epigrams and small lyrics. The same is true in general of Catullus.<sup>2</sup> Like Callimachus he chose the epigram and small lyric as the chief vehicles of his own passion, and the meagerness of his work in elegy and of the subjective-erotic element in these elegies (lxviii, lxxvi) together with the total lack of erotodidaxis have all the marks that should characterize the work of a pioneer who is attempting some advance over his model. Moreover, the theme of lxxvi, the Catullian elegy which is more nearly in the style of the Augustans than any other, is treated epigrammatically in lxxv and lxxii. Thus Catullus illustrates within his own work that relation between epigram and elegy—the former being the germ of the latter—which was later to assume such importance in the Augustans. This also marks his work as that of a pioneer.

The work of Parthenius in elegy and his connection with Gallus supply an additional argument of the same character. The *Ἀρήτη*

<sup>1</sup> This is true also of the fragments of Alexandrian elegy in general. Jacoby *op. cit.* has emphasized the same point in speaking of the subjective-erotic note. In the following paragraph I have used other arguments well expressed by Jacoby.

<sup>2</sup> Not, as Jacoby argues, completely true; for lxviii and lxxvi are subjective-erotic and the latter is an elegy rather than an epigram. The fact that it "stands among epigrams" (Jacoby) is of no importance since Catullus did not arrange the poems as we have them. Jacoby does not satisfactorily define the position of Catullus in elegy.

of Parthenius was, as Suidas tells us, an *ἐπικήδειον* in three books. It continued, therefore, the tradition which began with the *Λύδη* of Antimachus, so that as late as the time of Gallus the Greek poets were still writing a type of elegy quite different from that of the Augustans, and if they developed the Augustan type also we have no direct testimony of the fact. As Callimachus stands behind Catullus, so Parthenius stands behind Gallus, and there is no testimony that Gallus was didactic. In fact Ovid, *Tr.* ii. 445-68, seems to exclude Gallus from the rôle of erotic teacher which he assigns to both Tibullus and Propertius. Thus the gradual growth of this element in Roman elegy supplies us with an argument. There is no erotodidaxis in Catullian elegy, there was probably none in Gallus, it begins in Tibullus and Propertius, and is developed into a complete system by Ovid. Just as Ovid found the suggestions from which he developed the *Heroides* and the *Fasti* in his Roman predecessors, so he found there the elements of his great *Handbook of Love*—elements which he also had partly sketched in a tentative way in the *Amores*. But Ovid, as we have seen, reverted also to the didactic system of New Comedy. In this way the frequent references of Ovid and Propertius to Menander—especially to the *Thais*—find their natural explanation, and to that explanation I think that we must now return.<sup>1</sup>

Roman life and Roman character afford arguments which serve to strengthen the belief that the Roman elegists used the New Comedy directly. Menander was more familiar to the cultured Roman of the Augustan age and succeeding ages than any other Greek writer save Homer; cf. Quintil. i. 8, 5. The same authority would lead us to infer that Greek elegy was rarely taught in the schools. Ovid (*Tr.* ii. 369-70) substantiates the popularity of Menander:

fabula iucundi nulla est sine amore Menandri,  
et solet hic pueris virginibusque legi.

The authors read in schools<sup>2</sup> were studied with great thoroughness, passages being learned by heart. The students thus became thor-

<sup>1</sup> Prop. ii. 6, 1 ff.; iii. 21, 27 ff.; iv. 5, 41 ff.; Ovid *A.* i. 15, 17 f.; *A.A.* iii. 331 ff., 604; *R.A.* 382 ff.; *Tr.* 639 f. Most of these passages are directly connected with some detail of the comic system of erotic teaching.

<sup>2</sup> On this subject cf. Friedlaender *Sittengesch.* III, pp. 377 ff.

oughly familiar with the originals, but in addition the subject-matter of comedy and its stock characters, *leno*, *parasitus*, etc., were used to supply themes for rhetorical exercises (*suasoriae*) and poetic composition. Teachers were often poets, and poetic improvisation on the part of the students was encouraged. Such a system turned out many precocious poets: Catullus, Propertius, Ovid, and others. The case of Ovid is particularly enlightening because we have not only his own testimony (*Tr.* iv. 10) to his own precocity, but that of Seneca (*Controv.* ii. 2; ii. 10) that he was a *bonus declamator* whose rhetorical exercises were prose poems and that he borrowed from one of his teachers, Porcius Latro, many a sentence for his poetic compositions. Thus the characters and motives of comedy were bred into the very fiber of the Roman boy, and when he turned to elegiac composition, as he often did before he had finished his rhetorical training, it is highly improbable that he should have drawn the material of comedy only from Alexandrian elegy and not from the source with which he was most familiar. Even if he found that material in part already adapted to elegiac use by the Alexandrians, he could not have avoided making further adaptations and extensions.

That Roman tendency towards realism which is so marked in Propertius and Ovid and is not lacking in Tibullus has closer affinity with Menander than with Alexandrian elegy—at least as we know the latter. The truth with which Menander represented life even more than his perfection of style commended him to Roman taste. Why should they have contented themselves with those more or less diluted Menandrian motives, which they knew at least in epigram, when they were more familiar with the graphic originals? The “gilded youth” of Rome in the days of Catullus or Propertius lived much the same life as the indolent Greek of the Hellenistic Age. His erotic experience, as depicted by Propertius, Tibullus, and Ovid had already been recorded from life by the writers of comedy. When he attempted to record them over again, he found those writers more suggestive than all others. The result was a blend of literature and life. In our efforts to separate these elements today we can rarely attain sharpness of detail, and even in passages which are undoubtedly bookish probably the elegists themselves could not have traced every detail to its exact source among the many in

which they were steeped. When sources are so familiar, literary influence does not always operate consciously. At least their deference to woman is Roman, and the relatively high plane to which they elevate the love of woman has done more than anything else to ennoble that elegy in which, as Quintilian says, they "challenged the Greeks."

Thus by a combination of many things arose—more truly even than in Roman comedy—a genre that had not existed before, although nearly all the elements were to be found in Greek. In the combination, which is Roman, I have been led to the study of erotic teaching because in the developed elegiac form it is identical with the subjective-erotic element. If this brief outline adds any weight to the view that the Roman elegists took over the material of New Comedy directly and that an earlier adaptation of the same material by the Alexandrian elegists is improbable, I shall be content. Certainly erotic teaching is a striking characteristic of Augustan elegy and served, as I believe, to distinguish that elegy from the work of the Alexandrians as well as from that of Catullus and his contemporaries.